A & Z, Inc., d/b/a Albright Zimmerman and District 65, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America. Case 31-CA-11815

May 21, 1982

DECISION AND ORDER

By Members Fanning, Jenkins, and Zimmerman

Upon a charge filed on January 12, 1982, by District 65, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, herein called the Union, and duly served on A & Z, Inc., d/b/a Albright & Zimmerman, herein called Respondent, the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, by the Regional Director for Region 31, issued a complaint on February 9, 1982, against Respondent, alleging that Respondent had engaged in and was engaging in unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of Section 8(a)(5) and (1) and Section 2(6) and (7) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended. Copies of the charge and complaint and notice of hearing before an administrative law judge were duly served on the parties to this proceeding.

With respect to the unfair labor practices, the complaint alleges in substance that on December 4, 1981, following a Board election in Case 31-RC-5017, the Union was duly certified as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of Respondent's employees in the unit found appropriate; and that, commencing on or about December 21, 1981, and at all times thereafter, Respondent has refused, and continues to date to refuse, to bargain collectively with the Union as the exclusive bargaining representative, although the Union has requested and is requesting it to do so. On February 22, 1982, Respondent filed its answer to the complaint admitting in part, and denying in part, the allegations in the complaint.

On March 15, 1982, counsel for the General Counsel filed directly with the Board a Motion for Summary Judgment. Subsequently, on March 22, 1982, the Board issued an order transferring the proceeding to the Board and a Notice To Show Cause why the General Counsel's Motion for Summary Judgment should not be granted. Respondent

thereafter filed a response to the Notice To Show Cause.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 3(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, the National Labor Relations Board has delegated its authority in this proceeding to a three-member panel.

Upon the entire record in this proceeding, the Board makes the following:

Ruling on the Motion for Summary Judgment

In its answer to the complaint, Respondent denies that the Board's certification of the Union as the exclusive representative of the aforesaid employees was valid, contending instead that the certification was "both unlawful and improper and, therefore, null and void." Respondent also denies that the Union has requested to bargain with Respondent.² The General Counsel argues that there are no factual issues present which would require a hearing, since the issues underlying Respondent's opposition were previously litigated and decided in the companion representation proceeding.

Review of the record herein reveals that in Case 31-RC-5017 the petition was filed by the Union on February 27, 1981. The parties entered into a Stipulation for Certification Upon Consent Election agreement. The election was held on May 28, 1981. At the conclusion of the balloting, the tally revealed that 31 votes had been cast for and 16 votes had been cast against the Union. There were 10 challenged ballots. Respondent filed objections to the conduct of the election. On July 30, 1981, the Regional Director issued and served on the parties a Report on Objections in which he recommended that the objections be overruled and that a certification of representative be issued. Respondent, on August 12, 1981, filed exceptions to the Regional Director's Report on Objections. On December 4, 1981, the Board adopted the conclusions and recommendations of the Regional Director and issued a Decision and Certification of Representative (not reported in volumes of Board Decisions).

It is well settled that in the absence of newly discovered or previously unavailable evidence or special circumstances a respondent in a proceeding alleging a violation of Section 8(a)(5) is not entitled to relitigate issues which were or could have been litigated in a prior representation proceeding.³

¹ Official notice is taken of the record in the representation proceeding, Case 31-RC-5017, as the term "record" is defined in Secs. 102.68 and 102.69(g) of the Board's Rules and Regulations, Series 8, as amended. See LTV Electrosystems, Inc., 166 NLRB 938 (1967), enfd. 388 F.2d 683 (4th Cir. 1968); Golden Age Beverage Co., 167 NLRB 151 (1967), enfd. 415 F.2d 26 (5th Cir. 1969); Intertype Co. v. Penello, 269 F.Supp. 573 (D.C.Va. 1967); Follett Corp., 164 NLRB 378 (1967), enfd. 397 F.2d 91 (7th Cir. 1968); Sec. 9(d) of the NLRA, as amended.

² Notwithstanding Respondent's contention to the contrary, the record reveals that by letter dated December 14, 1981, the Union did request to meet and bargain with Respondent concerning wages, hours, and working conditions for the employees in the unit found appropriate. By return letter dated December 21, 1981, Respondent's attorney implicitly acknowledged receipt of the Union's December 14 letter and stated, "Our client intends to test the [Board] certification in the appropriate legal forum."

³ See Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. v. N.L.R.B., 313 U.S. 146, 162 (1941); Rules and Regulations of the Board, Secs. 102.67(f) and 102.69(c).

All issues raised by Respondent in this proceeding were or could have been litigated in the prior representation proceeding, and Respondent does not offer to adduce at a hearing any newly discovered or previously unavailable evidence, nor does it allege that any special circumstances exist herein which would require the Board to reexamine the decision made in the representation proceeding. We therefore find that Respondent has not raised any issue which is properly litigable in this unfair labor practice proceeding. Accordingly, we grant the Motion for Summary Judgment.

On the basis of the entire record, the Board makes the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

I. THE BUSINESS OF RESPONDENT

Respondent is a California corporation engaged in the manufacture of furniture in Van Nuys, California. In the course and conduct of its business operations, Respondent annually sells and ships goods and services valued in excess of \$50,000 directly to customers located outside the State of California.

We find, on the basis of the foregoing, that Respondent is, and has been at all times material herein, an employer engaged in commerce within the meaning of Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act, and that it will effectuate the policies of the Act to assert jurisdiction herein.

II. THE LABOR ORGANIZATION INVOLVED

District 65, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, is a labor organization within the meaning of Section 2(5) of the Act.

III. THE UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

A. The Representation Proceeding

1. The unit

The following employees of Respondent constitute a unit appropriate for collective-bargaining purposes within the meaning of Section 9(b) of the Act:

All production, maintenance, shipping, receiving and trucking employees; excluding all office employees, sales employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

2. The certification

On May 28, 1981, a majority of the employees of Respondent in said unit, in a secret-ballot election conducted under the supervision of the Regional Director for Region 31, designated the Union as

their representative for the purpose of collective bargaining with Respondent.

The Union was certified as the collective-bargaining representative of the employees in said unit on December 4, 1981, and the Union continues to be such exclusive representative within the meaning of Section 9(a) of the Act.

B. The Request To Bargain and Respondent's Refusal

Commencing on or about December 14, 1981, and at all times thereafter, the Union has requested Respondent to bargain collectively with it as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of all the employees in the above-described unit. Commencing on or about December 21, 1981, and continuing at all times thereafter to date, Respondent has refused, and continues to refuse, to recognize and bargain with the Union as the exclusive representative for collective bargaining of all employees in said unit.

Accordingly, we find that Respondent has, since December 21, 1981, and at all times thereafter, refused to bargain collectively with the Union as the exclusive representative of the employees in the appropriate unit, and that, by such refusal, Respondent has engaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the Act.

IV. THE EFFECT OF THE UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES UPON COMMERCE

The activities of Respondent set forth in section III, above, occurring in connection with its operations described in section I, above, have a close, intimate, and substantial relationship to trade, traffic, and commerce among the several States and tend to lead to labor disputes burdening and obstructing commerce and the free flow of commerce.

V. THE REMEDY

Having found that Respondent has engaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the Act, we shall order that it cease and desist therefrom, and, upon request, bargain collectively with the Union as the exclusive representative of all employees in the appropriate unit and, if an understanding is reached, embody such understanding in a signed agreement.

In order to insure that the employees in the appropriate unit will be accorded the services of their selected bargaining agent for the period provided by law, we shall construe the initial period of certification as beginning on the date Respondent com-

mences to bargain in good faith with the Union as the recognized bargaining representative in the appropriate unit. See Mar-Jac Poultry Company, Inc., 136 NLRB 785 (1962); Commerce Company d/b/a Lamar Hotel, 140 NLRB 226, 229 (1962), enfd. 328 F.2d 600 (5th Cir. 1964), cert. denied 379 U.S. 817; Burnett Construction Company, 149 NLRB 1419, 1421 (1964), enfd. 350 F.2d 57 (10th Cir. 1965).

The Board, upon the basis of the foregoing facts and the entire record, makes the following:

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1. A & Z, Inc., d/b/a Albright & Zimmerman, is an employer engaged in commerce within the meaning of Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.
- 2. District 65, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, is a labor organization within the meaning of Section 2(5) of the Act.
- 3. All production, maintenance, shipping, receiving, and trucking employees, excluding all office employees, sales employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act, constitute a unit appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining within the meaning of Section 9(b) of the Act.
- 4. Since December 4, 1981, the above-named labor organization has been and now is the certified and exclusive representative of all employees in the aforesaid appropriate unit for the purpose of collective bargaining within the meaning of Section 9(a) of the Act.
- 5. By refusing on or about December 21, 1981, and at all times thereafter, to bargain collectively with the above-named labor organization as the exclusive bargaining representative of all the employees of Respondent in the appropriate unit, Respondent has engaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of Section 8(a)(5) of the Act.
- 6. By the aforesaid refusal to bargain, Respondent has interfered with, restrained, and coerced, and is interfering with, restraining, and coercing, employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed them in Section 7 of the Act, and thereby has engaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of Section 8(a)(1) of the Act.
- 7. The aforesaid unfair labor practices are unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

ORDER

Pursuant to Section 10(c) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, the National Labor Relations Board hereby orders that the Respondent, A & Z, Inc., d/b/a Albright & Zimmerman, Van Nuys, California, its officers, agents, successors, and assigns, shall:

- 1. Cease and desist from:
- (a) Refusing to bargain collectively concerning rates of pay, wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment with District 65, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, as the exclusive bargaining representative of its employees in the following appropriate unit:

All production, maintenance, shipping, receiving and trucking employees; excluding all office employees, sales employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

- (b) In any like or related manner interfering with, restraining, or coercing employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed them in Section 7 of the Act.
- 2. Take the following affirmative action which the Board finds will effectuate the policies of the
- (a) Upon request, bargain with the above-named labor organization as the exclusive representative of all employees in the aforesaid appropriate unit with respect to rates of pay, wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment and, if an understanding is reached, embody such understanding in a signed agreement.
- (b) Post at its Van Nuys, California, facility copies of the attached notice marked "Appendix." Copies of said notice, on forms provided by the Regional Director for Region 31, after being duly signed by Respondent's representative, shall be posted by Respondent immediately upon receipt thereof, and be maintained by it for 60 consecutive days thereafter, in conspicuous places, including all places where notices to employees are customarily posted. Reasonable steps shall be taken by Respondent to ensure that said notices are not altered, defaced, or covered by any other material.
- (c) Notify the Regional Director for Region 31, in writing, within 20 days from the date of this Order, what steps have been taken to comply herewith.

⁴ In the event that this Order is enforced by a Judgment of a United States Court of Appeals, the words in the notice reading "Posted by Order of the National Labor Relations Board" shall read "Posted Pursuant to a Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals Enforcing an Order of the National Labor Relations Board."

APPENDIX

NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES
POSTED BY ORDER OF THE
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
An Agency of the United States Government

WE WILL NOT refuse to bargain collectively concerning rates of pay, wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment with District 65, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, as the exclusive representative of the employees in the bargaining unit described below.

WE WILL NOT in any like or related manner interfere with, restrain, or coerce our employ-

ees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed them by Section 7 of the Act.

WE WILL, upon request, bargain with the above-named Union, as the exclusive representative of all employees in the bargaining unit described below, with respect to rates of pay, wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment and, if an understanding is reached, embody such understanding in a signed agreement. The bargaining unit is:

All production, maintenance, shipping, receiving and trucking employees; excluding all office employees, sales employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

A & Z, Inc., D/B/A ALBRIGHT & ZIMMERMAN